

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated December 4, 2006, all originally filed claims 1-34 stand rejected (please note that the Examiner, through typographical error, indicates on the Office Action Summary that claims 1-37 stand rejected). Claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,406,227 issued to Titus et al. (hereinafter "the Titus patent"). Claims 5-12, 15, 18, and 30-34 stand rejected under §103(a) as obvious over the Titus patent in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0154135 to Covington (hereinafter "the Covington application"). Claims 17 and 27 stand rejected under §103(a) as obvious over the Titus patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,382,784 issued to Eberhardt (hereinafter "the Eberhardt patent"). Claim 24 stands rejected under §103(a) as obvious over the Titus patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,911 issued to Almblad (hereinafter "the Almblad patent"). Claim 21 stands rejected under §103(a) as obvious over the Titus patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,064,747 issued to Wills et al. (hereinafter "the Wills patent"). Claims 22 and 23 stand rejected under §103(a) as obvious over the Titus patent and the Wills patent and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,457 issued to Lemelson (hereinafter "the Lemelson patent"). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the following amendments and arguments in support of allowance of the rejected claims.

Based upon the Examiner's comments in rejecting claims 1-34, Applicants believe that clarification is required. Generally, and not with reference to any particular claim, Applicants' invention is directed to a system having a user interface for inputting information related to a first object and a database for comparison of known information against the inputted information to identify a master object. That master object is then identified from a physical display of a set of master objects.

An example of a physical display of a set of master objects is shown in FIG. 15 which comprises a rack 100 having an organized grid of light sources 102, such as LEDs, incandescent bulbs or the like. Individual product items 106 can be stored and/or displayed proximate to the appropriate light source 102. These light sources are selectively wired and arranged to interact with the system to identify the identified master object from all other product items stored or displayed adjacent thereto. This is only a single embodiment and in no way limits any interpretation of the claims. It is Applicants' hope that this brief explanation further clarifies the Examiner's understanding of the written description. No new matter has been included to provide this description.

**35 U.S.C. §102(e):**

Claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,406,227 issued to Titus et al. (hereinafter "the Titus patent"). Independent claims 1 and 19 have been amended for clarification.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the display means is associated with a physical display of a set of master objects for identifying the identified master object to the user from the physical set of master objects. In the Titus patent, as recited at column 10, lines 1-10, a user interacts with the apparatus via a display 920 and a keypad 922, which are interfaced with the central control system 902 via the plug-in operator interface 924. The display 920 is a computer monitor for displaying information. Titus's computer monitor is not associated with a physical display of a set of master objects and the Titus disclosure does not suggest such. Therefore, claim 1 is distinguishable from the Titus patent. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom.

Claim 19 has been amended to indicate that the display holds a physical set of master objects and that the means for distinguishing the identified master object from the physical set of master objects receives the output signal. The display 920 of the Titus patent is a computer monitor for displaying information and does not hold a physical set of master objects and the Titus disclosure does not suggest such. As such, claim 19 is distinguishable from the Titus patent. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of claim 19 and all claims depending therefrom.

Claim 20 has been cancelled and claim 21 has been amended to recite that the display comprises a display rack for holding the physical set of master objects.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a):**

Applicants believe that the above arguments and amendments to independent claims 1 and 19 clearly distinguish the claims from the Titus reference. As such, Applicants believe any possible combination of the Titus reference with the Covington application, the Eberhardt patent, the Almblad patent, the Wills patent, or the Lemelson patent cannot support an obviousness rejection. Therefore, based upon the above arguments and amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all §103(a) rejections.

Should the Examiner have any questions pertaining to the above, undersigned Counsel would welcome a phone call to provide any further clarification or discussion.

Therefore, based upon the above, Applicants respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Risto Pribisich  
Reg. No. 55,859  
McDonald Hopkins LLC  
600 Superior Avenue, E.  
Suite 2100  
Cleveland, OH 44114-2653  
(216) 348-5427

Date: APRIL 4, 2007